

\*\*\*\*\***DRAFT MINUTES**\*\*\*\*\*

Alexandria Board of Architectural Review  
Old & Historic Alexandria District

**Wednesday, February 1, 2012**  
7:30pm, City Council Chambers, City Hall  
301 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Members Present: Tom Hulfish, Chairman  
Chip Carlin  
Oscar Fitzgerald  
Wayne Neale  
Peter Smeallie

Members Absent: Art Keleher  
John von Senden

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning  
Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager  
Courtney Lankford, Historic Preservation Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 p.m. by Chairman Hulfish.

---

**I. MINUTES**

1. Consideration of the minutes of the public hearing of January 4, 2012.  
**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as amended, 6-0.**

Dr. Fitzgerald move to amend the motion relating to the January 18, 2012 OHAD BAR hearing Item #2, Case BAR2011-0362 for 400 North Union Street by striking “Denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the dormer on the front (east) façade.” and substituting “Restudy of the dormer on the front (east) façade.” He noted that the applicant had been confused at the previous hearing about the Board’s intent and desired to work with the owner to find a mutually acceptable architectural solution, if possible.

On a motion by Dr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Smeallie, the minutes were approved, as amended, 5-0.

---

**II. CONSENT ITEMS**

Items on the Consent Calendar are those where the applicant has agreed to all conditions of approval shown in the staff reports. Without objection, the staff recommendation for these cases will be approved as a group by unanimous consent of the Board at the beginning of the meeting. When announced by the Chairman, any member of the Board or of the public may ask that one of these cases be removed for full discussion.

**1. CASE BAR2012-0001**

Request for alterations at **703 King St**, zoned KR King Street Retail

APPLICANT: Seyedhossein Shoja Maddahi

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as submitted, on the Consent Calendar 5-0.**

On a motion by Mr. Smeallie, seconded by Mr. Neale, the Consent Calendar was unanimously approved, 5-0.

---

**III. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**2. CASE BAR2011-0363**

Request for alterations at **326 King St**, zoned KR King Street Retail

APPLICANT: East Banc, Inc. by Robert M. Gurney

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as amended, 5-0.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. That the second floor office signage be removed from the north and west elevations and that a coordinated sign plan for this building be submitted to the Board before any new signs are approved for the ground floor tenant;
2. That the applicant clean and repaint the concrete egress stairs on the east side of the King Street façade.
3. That the final design details of the storefront glazing be approved by Staff, based on the Board's comments at the hearing.
4. That the applicant prepare a revised front and side elevation showing a cast stone lintel that is a minimum 5 courses tall with 4" positive bearings on either side of the large openings, to be approved by Staff;
5. That all first floor storefront panels be recessed approximately 8";
6. That the muntins in the transom above the entryway, only, be removed to allow for future signage.

**SPEAKERS**

Robert Gurney, architect, spoke on behalf of the application. Mr. Gurney noted that since the deferral, he has tried to address the various comments and concerns of the Board, including reworking the proportions of the windows and their muntins and the solidier course above the windows. He presented two schemes for their review, but noted that he would prefer for scheme two (Mondrian) to be approved.

John Hynan, Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke in opposition to the application. He stated that HAF believes 326 King Street to be an excellent reproduction of Georgian design and that the HAF favored leaving the storefront the way it is.

Mr. Gurney stated that as part of the revision, he included muntin bars in all of the transoms, including above the door. He displayed an additional rendering with the muntin bars removed from the transom above the entry door so that this transom could be used for future signage, as suggested by Staff.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Smeallie stated that he preferred the Modernist scheme number two. He felt that the building would be improved and that it would bring a retail tenant who would live up to the design.

Mr. Neale stated that the design had improved and that he liked the proportions of the openings. However, he stated he had issues with placing the contemporary elements on a traditional façade. He was also concerned with the separation of the first floor and the rest of the building as he felt there was not a strong enough architectural demarcation between the two architectural styles on this facade. In regards to the lintels, he felt brick jack arches or segmental arches would be better than the solid course lintels.

Dr. Fitzgerald stated that the storefront configuration would be a big improvement to the building and did not believe the existing structure was a well-designed Georgian Revival design. He felt that both schemes presented contemporary window replacements, regardless of the muntin configuration, and supported either.

Mr. Carlin addressed the possibility of using a wood, cast stone, or steel C-channel lintel above this width opening instead of the brick soldier course. Mr. Carlin asked Mr. Neale if he would be comfortable any of these. Mr. Neale stated that he would support a stone lintel and suggested that it should be approximately 5 courses tall with a 4" minimum bearing on each end. Mr. Carlin agreed that removing the muntins from the transom above the entry would accommodate future signage. Mr. Carlin commented on the 4" recess of the storefront windows from the brick façade and suggested recessing them even more, to approximately 8". He stated that recessing the panels would give the building a more three dimensional quality and more visual integrity in terms of the new lintels.

Mr. Carlin made a motion to approve the Staff recommendation for scheme one, with the amendments noted above.

Mr. Neale seconded the motion but stated he did not object to scheme two. Chairman Hulfish stated that several neighbors had indicated to him that they prefer scheme one. Mr. Carlin felt that the alterations should be more traditional. Mr. Smeallie argued for scheme two, but the motion stood for approval of scheme one. The motion passed 5-0.

## **REASON**

The Board generally found that the existing building was not a particularly good example of Georgian Revival architecture and supported enlarging the windows for retail use but believed the changes should be compatible with the traditional design of the rest of the building.

**3. CASE BAR2012-0005**

Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at **420 S Lee St**, zoned RM Residential

APPLICANT: Thomas Byrne

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as amended, by a roll call vote, 5-0.**

This item was combined with Item #4 for discussion purposes.

**4. CASE BAR2012-0006**

Request for addition and alterations at **420 S Lee St**, zoned RM Residential

APPLICANT: Thomas Byrne

BOARD ACTION: **Approved, as amended, by a roll call vote, 5-0.**

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The applicant will contact BAR staff prior to the replacement in-kind of any of the original wood siding.
2. That the manufacturer's cut sheet for the proposed standing seam metal roof will be included in the building permit application.
3. That the new windows will be painted wood SDL and comply with Alexandria's *Window Policy*.
4. The statements in archaeology conditions below shall appear in the General Notes of all site plans and on all site plan sheets that involve demolition or ground disturbance (including Demolition, Basement/Foundation Plans, Landscaping, Erosion and Sediment Control, Grading, Utilities and Sheeting and Shoring) so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements:
  - a. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology (703/838-4399) two weeks before the starting date of any ground disturbance so that an inspection schedule for city archaeologists can be arranged.
  - b. The applicant/developer shall call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) if any buried structural remains (wall foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc.) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
  - c. The applicant/developer shall not allow any metal detection or other artifact collection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.
5. Complete construction drawings be submitted to Staff for approval prior to any modifications to the existing design of the front fence and gate.

**SPEAKERS**

Thomas Byrne, owner, spoke on behalf of the application.

Stewart Dunn, resident at 418 S Lee Street, spoke in support of the application.

John Hynan, Historic Alexandria Foundation, spoke in support of the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Dr. Fitzgerald supported the application but suggested that the applicant remove the storm door on the front façade.

Mr. Carlin asked the applicant about the discrepancy between the elevation drawing of the window in the projecting bay window, which showed a 1/1 window, and the specification sheet which showed one solid pane of glass. The applicant stated that the window on the sides of the bay would be 1/1, as shown on the elevation drawing.

Mr. Carlin inquired about the height of the gate if the existing iron fence is lowered. The applicant stated that he intends to remove some of the horizontal bars and filigree work from the middle of the gate to make it simpler and match the proposed height of the fence. He intends to reduce the height of the retaining wall by eight courses of brick, re-grade the earth behind, and then reinstall the existing cast iron fence at sidewalk level. While Mr. Carlin felt that the current fence was historically significant in its own right, he felt that the wicket and spear fence shown in the 1930s photo should be copied in order to bring more integrity to the site. He, nevertheless, supported modifying the gate and removing the brick retaining wall, as proposed.

Mr. Byrne inquired about the possibility of using aluminum clad wood windows on the rear. The Chairman stated that aluminum clad wood windows would not comply with the *Window Policy*.

Mr. Smeallie made a motion to approve the Staff recommendation with the addition of the standard archeological conditions. Mr. Neale seconded the motion. Mr. Carlin offered a friendly amendment requiring Staff to approve construction drawings prior to modification of the fence and gate. Mr. Smeallie and Mr. Neale agreed to amend their motion, which passed by a roll call vote, 5-0.

### **REASON**

The Board generally found that the alterations were sensitive to the historic structure. They did not support the applicant's request for aluminum clad wood windows on the c1900 addition, as this did not comply with the Board's adopted Window Policy.

---

### **III. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

---

#### **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

The following items are shown for information only. Based on the Board's adopted policies, these have been approved by Staff since the previous Board meeting.

##### **CASE BAR2012-0012**

Request for storm doors at **609 Oronoco St**, zoned RM Residential

APPLICANT: Frederick & Susan Lowther

##### **CASE BAR2012-0013**

Request for door replacement at **801 King St**, zoned KR King Street Retail

APPLICANT: Austin Grill

##### **CASE BAR2012-0018**

Request for signage at **1314 King St**, zoned KR King Street Retail

APPLICANT: Dejavu

##### **CASE BAR2012-0019**

Request for deck replacement at **1007 Cameron St**, zoned CL Commercial

APPLICANT: Steven Burke

---

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Hulfish adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:22pm.

Minutes submitted by,

Al Cox, FAIA, Historic Preservation Manager  
Boards of Architectural Review